

S.N.: 10/666,875  
Art Unit: 2687

### REMARKS

Claims 1-62 are pending. Claims 1, 18, and 40 have been amended for clarification. New claims 48-62 have been added to enhance patent coverage of applicant's claimed invention. The subject matter of claims 48-62 is supported by pages 3-4, page 6, lines 12-17, page 10, lines 17-23, of the specification as filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Two paragraphs have been added to the beginning of the detailed description. These paragraphs are supported by the summary of the invention as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The Patent Office objected to claims 18 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, because the word "new" was recited in the claims. Claims 18 and 40 have been amended to overcome this objection. The Patent Office is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to claims 18 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-47 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ketola, U.S. Patent No. 6,879,997.

For a claim to be anticipated, each and every non-inherent limitation must be disclosed in a reference. MPEP 2131.

Claim 1 recites "A method to operate a plurality of mobile terminals, comprising storing an editable object in the plurality of mobile terminals, and simultaneously editing the editable object using at least some of the plurality of mobile terminals, where **the mobile terminals that are used for editing the editable object send locally generated edit commands to other mobile terminals of the set of mobile terminals.**"

Claim 24 recites "A computer program stored on a computer readable media for directing a computer to execute a method that comprises storing an editable object in a mobile terminal that is a member of a set of mobile terminals; editing the editable object in the mobile terminal; and **transmitting edit commands to other members of the set of mobile terminals.**"

Claim 25 recites "A mobile terminal, comprising a wireless transceiver, a data processor, and a memory for use in storing an editable object, editing the editable object and **transmitting, via the wireless transceiver, edit commands to other members of a set of mobile terminals that also store and edit the same editable object.**"

S.N.: 10/666,875  
Art Unit: 2687

Claim 26 recites “A wireless communication system comprising a plurality of mobile terminals at least one comprising means for editing an editable object and for **transmitting information that comprises edit commands**, via the wireless communications system, to **others of the plurality of mobile terminals for implementing collaborative editing of said editable object.**”

Applicant believes the rejection of claims 1-47 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated is incorrect.

As to claim 1, the Patent Office asserted that “where the mobile terminals that are used for editing the editable object send locally generated edit commands to other mobile terminals of the set of mobile terminals” is disclosed by Ketola, col. 7, lines 50-63. Ketola (col. 7, lines 50-63) discloses “The manual input device 210 may include a keyboard, a mouse, and/or other devices operated by hand. The resulting document changes are immediately displayed for the user’s observation on his own display 238, while at the same time the changes are communicated to users elsewhere. The ensuing process of communicating the changes is accomplished with various software and hardware components including, for example, document sharing programs, controllers, and servers. This document-sharing process may all be accompanied by voice discussion going on simultaneously on a conference channel available to all participants, and preferably there will be means for written discussion (e.g. suggested text being sent to the editor).” This passage of Ketola is not anticipatory as it does not appear to disclose a transmission of edit commands and transmission of edit commands is not inherent as document changes may be transmitted as data instead of as commands or instructions.

This above reasoning applies to claims 1 and 24.

As to claim 25, the Patent Office asserted that “edit commands “with editing commands being sent” col. 2, lines 17-19” to other members of a set of mobile terminals that also store and edit the same editable object (See col. 10 through col. 11, lines 57-37).” Ketola (col. 2, lines 17-19) discloses related art in which “documents that are created and stored in office systems can already be viewed by users of multiple personal computers, with editing commands being sent for participating terminals to the other participating terminals. See, for instance, Adams (U.S. Pat. No. 5,781,732).” It appears as if the Patent Office is using Ketola’s description of the prior art as part of Ketola’s detailed description of the invention and is making an obviousness type of

S.N.: 10/666,875  
Art Unit: 2687

rejection of claim 25 by combining an embodiment of the detailed description of Ketola with the background of the invention of Ketola. It is not a proper basis of an anticipatory rejection to treat the background of the invention of a patent as part of the detailed description of the invention. The cited passages of Ketola then do not anticipate claim 25.

As the same passages from the background of the invention and the detailed description of the invention from Ketola were cited in rejecting claim 26, claim 26 is not anticipated by the cited passages of Ketola.

Given the above line of reasoning, it appears that the Patent Office may have intended to reject claims 1, 24, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103. In which case, Applicant states

Patent application serial no. 10/666,875, to Makela, and Patent No. 6,879,997, Ketola, were at the time the invention of patent application serial no. 10/666,875 was made, owned by Nokia Corporation.

Applicant thus requests that Ketola, U.S. Patent No. 6,879,997, be disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-47 have been amended and are believed to be in allowable form.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims 1-62 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Ketola, U.S. Patent No. 6,879,997, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-62 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of all claims is earnestly solicited.

S.N.: 10/666,875  
Art Unit: 2687

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski      Feb. 24, 2006  
Walter J. Malinowski      Date  
Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400  
Facsimile: (203)944-0245

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

February 24, 2006      John Bongell  
Date      Name of Person Making Deposit